



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,977	03/25/2004	John A. Baldassa	GP-302861	7068
7590 11/02/2005			EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER DEVRIES			TRAN, DALENA	
General Motors Corporation			ART UNIT	
Mail Code 482-C23-B21			PAPER NUMBER	
P.O. Box 300			3661	
Detroit, MI 48265-3000			DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/808,977	Applicant(s) BALDASSA, JOHN A.	
	Examiner Dalena Tran	Art Unit 3661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This office action is responsive to the amendment filed on 8/22/05. Claims 1-38 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 6-7, 12, and 18-19, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (6,434,478) in view of Bassett (US 2003/0041329 A1), and Anthony et al. (6,873,261).

As per claim 1, Ikeda discloses a website interface system for a vehicle, comprising: a vehicle that includes a first camera (see columns 8-9, lines 57-46), a remote device that includes a first display and a first microphone (see column 12, lines 21-63), and a vehicle website provider that communicates with vehicle and remote device and that establishes a communications interface between vehicle and remote device (see columns 5-7, lines 54-44), and first display displays an image from first camera and wherein a user of remote device uses first microphone to communicate with an occupant of vehicle (see columns 12-13, lines 21-17). Ikeda does not disclose remote device controls a position of first camera. However, Bassett disclose remote device controls a position of first camera through communications interface (see [0040] to [0041]; and [0043] through [0051]). Also, Anthony et al. disclose remote device

Art Unit: 3661

controls a position of first camera through communications interface (see the abstract; columns 5-6, lines 15-8; columns 6-7, lines 29-15; columns 8-9, lines 1-48; column 10, lines 5-34; columns 10-11, lines 66-67; and columns 17-18, lines 54-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda by combining remote device controls a position of first camera through communications interface for monitoring and tracking vehicle position.

As per claims 6-7, Ikeda discloses vehicle includes a second microphone and wherein occupant uses second microphone to-communicate with user, and vehicle includes a second display and remote device includes a second camera and wherein second display displays an image from second camera (see columns 8-9, lines 57-46).

As per claim 12, Ikeda discloses vehicle includes a controller that stores an image from first camera (see columns 8-9, lines 57-46).

As per claim 18, Ikeda discloses remote device communicates with vehicle website provider through one of a private connection and an Internet protocol address (see columns 11-12, lines 61-19; columns 15-16, lines 40-47; and columns 18-19, lines 58-31).

As per claim 19, Ikeda discloses remote device is one of a personal computer, a mobile telephone, and a personal digital assistant device (see columns 6-7, lines 51-23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3661

5. Claims 2-3, 9, and 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (6,434,478), Bassett (US 2003/0041329 A1), and Anthony et al. (6,873,261) as applied to claims 1, and 12 above, and further in view of Schuyler (6,429,773).

As per claim 2, Ikeda, Bassett, and Anthony et al. do not disclose remote device controls an engine of said vehicle. However, Schuyler discloses remote device controls an engine of said vehicle through said communications interface (see columns 3-4, lines 58-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda, Bassett, and Anthony et al. by combining remote device controls an engine of said vehicle for security interact with vehicle control system.

Also, as per claim 3, Schuyler discloses remote device one of activates and deactivates said engine (see columns 4-5, lines 51-25).

As per claim 9, Schuyler discloses remote device controls a loudspeaker that is located on an exterior of vehicle through communications interface (see columns 8-9, lines 48-9).

As per claim 15, Ikeda, Bassett, and Anthony et al. do not disclose user uploads image to data storage device. However, Schuyler discloses vehicle website provider includes a data storage device and wherein user uploads image to data storage device (see column 5, lines 26-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda, Bassett, and Anthony et al. by combining user uploads image to data storage device to collect vehicle data performance for monitoring the vehicle.

6. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (6,434,478), Bassett (US 2003/0041329 A1), and Anthony et al. (6,873,261) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kahn (US 2004/0155808 A1).

As per claims 4-5, Ikeda, Bassett, and Anthony et al. do not disclose remote device controls a door of vehicle. However, Kahn disclose remote device controls a door of vehicle through communications interface, and remote devices one of locks and unlocks door (see [0008]; [0014] to [0015]; and [0018] to [0019]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda, Bassett, and Anthony et al. by combining remote device controls a door of vehicle to control vehicle security.

7. Claims 8, 13-14, and 16-17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (6,434,478), Bassett (US 2003/0041329 A1), and Anthony et al. (6,873,261) as applied to claims 7, and 12 above, and further in view of Ebrami (US 2003/0053536 A1).

As per claim 8, Ikeda does not disclose second display is only activated when an engine of vehicle is deactivated. However, Ebrami discloses the second display is only activated when an engine of vehicle is deactivated (see [0043] to [0045]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda by combining second display is only activated when an engine of vehicle is deactivated to monitor vehicle accident or events happening to the vehicle.

As per claim 13, Ikeda does not disclose captures at least one image from first camera when vehicle is impacted. However, Ebrami discloses controller automatically captures at least one image from first camera when vehicle is impacted (see [0024] to [0028]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda by combining captures at least one image from first camera when vehicle is impacted for acquiring and transmitting environmental information recorded around vehicle for analyzing the vehicle accident.

Art Unit: 3661

Also, as per claim 14, Ebrami discloses wherein a position of first camera automatically adjusts as controller automatically captures at least two images from first camera (see [0029] to [0032]).

As per claim 16, Ebrami discloses vehicle website provider receives vehicle parameters from vehicle and displays vehicle parameters on first display (see [0033] to [0039]; and [0046] to [0048]).

As per claim 17, Ikeda disclose vehicle website provider receives global positioning information from vehicle and displays a location of vehicle on first display (see column 9, lines 48-57).

8. Claims 10-11, 20-22, and 25-38, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (6,434,478), Bassett (US 2003/0041329 A1), Anthony et al. (6,873,261), and Schuyler (6,429,773) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Ebrami (US 2003/0053536 A1).

As per claims 10-11, Ikeda, and Schuyler do not disclose user uses first microphone to communicate with entities that are located exterior to vehicle. However, Ebrami discloses user uses first microphone to communicate with entities that are located exterior to vehicle through loudspeaker, and vehicle includes a second microphone that is located on exterior and wherein user and entities use first and second microphones, respectively, to communicate (see [0033] to [0039]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda, and Schuyler by combining user uses first microphone to communicate with entities that are located exterior to vehicle to report the state of vehicle to a remote location for monitoring the vehicle status.

As per claims 20, and 25-26, Ikeda discloses a website interface system for a vehicle, comprising: a vehicle that includes a first camera (see columns 8-9, lines 57-46), a remote device that includes a first display and a first microphone (see columns 6-7, lines 51-24; and columns 7-8, lines 45-10), and a vehicle website provider that communicates with vehicle and remote device and that establishes a communications interface between vehicle and remote device (see columns 5-7, lines 54-44), and first display displays an image from first camera and wherein a user of remote device uses first microphone to communicate with an occupant of vehicle (see columns 12-13, lines 21-17). Ikeda does not disclose remote device controls a position of first camera. However, Bassett disclose remote device controls a position of first camera through communications interface (see [0040] to [0041]; and [0043] through [0051]). Also, Anthony et al. disclose remote device controls a position of first camera through communications interface (see the abstract; columns 5-6, lines 15-8; columns 6-7, lines 29-15; columns 8-9, lines 1-48; column 10, lines 5-34; columns 10-11, lines 66-67; and columns 17-18, lines 54-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda by combining remote device controls a position of first camera through communications interface for monitoring and tracking vehicle position.

Ikeda do not disclose loudspeaker that is located on an exterior of vehicle. However, Schuyler discloses a loudspeaker that is located on an exterior of vehicle (see columns 8-9, lines 48-9). Ikeda, also does not disclose user uses first microphone to communicate with entities that are located exterior to vehicle. However, Ebrami discloses user uses first microphone to communicate with entities that are located exterior to vehicle through loudspeaker, and vehicle includes a second microphone that is located on exterior and wherein user and entities use first

Art Unit: 3661

and second microphones, respectively, to communicate (see [0033] to [0039]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda, by combining loudspeaker that is located on an exterior of vehicle, and user uses first microphone to communicate with entities that are located exterior to vehicle to report the state of vehicle to a remote location for monitoring the vehicle status.

As per claim 21, Schuyler discloses remote device controls an engine of said vehicle through said communications interface (see columns 3-4, lines 58-50).

Also, as per claim 22, Schuyler discloses remote device one of activates and deactivates said engine (see columns 4-5, lines 51-25).

As per claims 27-28, Ikeda discloses vehicle includes a second microphone and wherein occupant uses second microphone to-communicate with user, and vehicle includes a second display and remote device includes a second camera and wherein second display displays an image from second camera (see columns 8-9, lines 57-46).

As per claim 29, Ikeda, and Schuyler do not disclose second display is only activated when an engine of vehicle is deactivated. However, Ebrami discloses the second display is only activated when an engine of vehicle is deactivated (see [0043] to [0045]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda, and Schuyler by combining second display is only activated when an engine of vehicle is deactivated to monitor vehicle accident or events happening to the vehicle.

As per claim 30, Ikeda, and Schuyler do not disclose a second microphone that is located on exterior and wherein user and entities use first and second microphones, respectively, to communicate. However, Ebrami discloses vehicle includes a second microphone that is located

Art Unit: 3661

on exterior and wherein user and entities use first and second microphones, respectively, to communicate (see [0033] to [0039]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda, and Schuyler by combining a second microphone that is located on exterior and wherein user and entities use first and second microphones, respectively, to communicate to report the state of vehicle to a remote location for monitoring the vehicle status.

As per claim 31, Ikeda discloses vehicle includes a controller that stores an image from first camera (see columns 8-9, lines 57-46).

As per claim 32, Ikeda does not disclose captures at least one image from first camera when vehicle is impacted. However, Ebrami discloses controller automatically captures at least one image from first camera when vehicle is impacted (see [0024] to [0028]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda by combining captures at least one image from first camera when vehicle is impacted for acquiring and transmitting environmental information recorded around vehicle for analyzing the vehicle accident.

Also, as per claim 33, Ebrami discloses wherein a position of first camera automatically adjusts as controller automatically captures at least two images from first camera (see [0029] to [0032]).

As per claim 34, Schuyler discloses vehicle website provider includes a data storage device and wherein user uploads image to data storage device (see column 5, lines 26-37).

Art Unit: 3661

As per claim 35, Ebrami discloses vehicle website provider receives vehicle parameters from vehicle and displays vehicle parameters on first display (see [0033] to [0039]; and [0046] to [0048]).

As per claim 36, Ikeda disclose vehicle website provider receives global positioning information from vehicle and displays a location of vehicle on first display (see column 9, lines 48-57).

As per claim 37, Ikeda discloses remote device communicates with vehicle website provider through one of a private connection and an Internet protocol address (see columns 11-12, lines 61-19; columns 15-16, lines 40-47; and columns 18-19, lines 58-31).

As per claim 38, Ikeda discloses remote device is one of a personal computer, a mobile telephone, and a personal digital assistant device (see columns 6-7, lines 51-23).

9. Claims 23-24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (6,434,478), Bassett (US 2003/0041329 A1), Anthony et al. (6,873,261), Schuyler (6,429,773), and Ebrami (US 2003/0053536 A1) as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Kahn (US 2004/0155808 A1).

As per claims 23-24, Ikeda, Schuyler, and Ebrami do not disclose remote device controls a door of vehicle. However, Kahn discloses remote device controls a door of vehicle through communications interface, and remote devices one of locks and unlocks door (see [0008]; [0014] to [0015]; and [0018] to [0019]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Ikeda, Schuyler, and Ebrami by combining remote device controls a door of vehicle to control vehicle security.

Art Unit: 3661

Conclusion

10. Applicant's response filed on 8/22/05 have been fully considered. Upon updated search, the new ground of rejection as above.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dalena Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-6968. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30 AM-4:00 PM), off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on 571-272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner
Dalena Tran


October 28, 2005